DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 855 SO 000 661

AUTHOR Limbacher, Philip C.
TITLE A Study of the Effects of Microteaching Experiences Upon the Classroom Behavior of Social Studies Student Teachers.
PUB DATE Feb 71
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference, American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, February 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Field Studies, Interaction Process Analysis, *Laboratory Training, Methods Courses, *Microteaching, *Preservice Education, *Protocol Materials, Research Projects, Secondary School Teachers, Social Studies, *Student Teaching, Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Teaching Techniques Laboratory

ABSTRACT

The hypotheses of this field study, conducted in connection with the Teaching Techniques Laboratory at the University of Illinois, were that student teachers who had participated in a supervised, laboratory, microteaching experience would: 1) receive more favorable pupil evaluations of an initial and final teaching effort on the Teacher Performance Appraisal Scale; 2) receive more favorable pupil evaluations of their overall effectiveness on the Illinois Evaluation Questionnaire; 3) be judged by their cooperating teachers to be ready earlier to assume full responsibility for classroom instruction; and, 4) have higher Indirect/Direct ratios as revealed by Flanders' interaction analysis technique. The population consisted of two different sections of a required methods course, each comprising 25 social studies student teachers, one group having participated in the training, the other not. Thirty-three tapes were obtained of initial teaching efforts; thirty-two of these were re-taped during the last week of student teaching. The first two hypotheses were confirmed; the latter two were not. The lack of significant results on the fourth hypothesis, however, was felt to be at least partially attributable to an uncontrolled variable. The data strongly suggest that videotaped microteaching can be an effective innovation in teacher preparation. (JLB)

ED046855

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF MICROTEACHING EXPERIENCES UPON THE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENT TEACHERS

by

Philip C. Limbacher

Texas A&M University

College Station, Texas 77843

SP 000661

Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, New York, February, 1971.

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF MICROTEACHING EXPERIENCES
UPON THE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR OF SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENT TEACHERS

All institutions preparing students to become teachers are faced with the common task of providing their students with opportunities to develop effective classroom behavior before they begin student teaching. A student poorly prepared in evaluating learning situations and individual instructional techniques may find student teaching a frustrating and potentially damaging experience. Most institutions rely on an on-campus methods course that may or may not provide opportunities for practice teaching; if provided, they are usually some variation of peer teaching. Practice and evaluation of beginning teaching efforts are thus heavily colored by a "cooperate and graduate" atmosphere. In reality, most institutions rely upon the cooperating teacher and his class to provide the initial opportunities for the beginning teacher to practice his classroom skills. Under these circumstances it is no wonder that the student teacher's early attempts to develop effective classroom skills frequently become instead practice in survival training. Goodlad comments on the effect of placing a beginning teacher in this anxiety-producing situation as follows:

> But the cards are stacked in favor of his (student teacher) controlling habit becoming fixed with little reference to the principles of pedagogy; the student teacher's need to survive, together with the cooperating teacher's need to have him survive, are powerful factors adding to other factors favoring early closure in survival skills.[1]

One of the "other factors" to which Goodlad alludes could well be the failure of many teacher preparation institutions to provide their students with laboratory experiences designed to give them on-campus supervised

[1]John J. Goodlad, "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the Education of Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, XVI, No. 3 (1965), 266.

practice experiences aimed toward developing these vital classroom skills. A student so equipped should hopefully enter student teaching less anxious and more apt to practice and develop pedagogic rather than mere survival skills. One such program with this goal in mind is in use at the Teaching Techniques Laboratory of the University of Illinois. The program provides student teachers with from six to nine videotaped microteaching experiences prior to student teaching. These microlessons are scaled-down teaching episodes of approximately ten minutes presented to a class consisting of four, five, or six high school students or college freshmen. The lessons are videotaped and a twenty minute period allotted immediately after the lesson for evaluation by the pupils and a Laboratory supervisor. The pupil evaluations are made on a ten item rating scale covering aims, content, method, evaluation, and accomplishment. The supervisor uses these pupil ratings and the videotaped lesson as the prime instruments for his evaluation. The supervisors check constantly for the degree of skill exhibited by the student teacher in monitoring and reacting to the behavior of his pupils, making primary use of the potent feedback available through the videotape. An attempt is made to provide the student teacher an approximation of the real classroom environment, one in which he can learn and practice relevant teaching skills and thus develop classroom attitudes based on these controlled experiences. The Laboratory is a unique learning situation in that it exists solely for the improvement of the teacher. The pupils are paid to attend, and any increase of their knowledge or skill is incidental. This allows the beginning teacher to experiment and, if mistakes are made, to feel little concern for their effect upon the pupils. This freedom to experiment and to make mistakes at little cost to the student teacher is not available during his student teaching experience.

Opportunities to obtain reactions of student teachers during and after their Laboratory experiences are frequent. Many students have expressed the belief that the teaching responsibilities required by the Laboratory have given them increased confidence and provided them with a stimulating but not overwhelming first contact with the classroom. However, little empirical evidence was available to support these reactions. These favorable student teacher evaluations of the program were important; but of greater importance was the answer to the question, "Does the Laboratory program have a demonstrable effect on their student teaching experience?" To find out a field study was designed and initiated; the major findings are summarized in this paper.

Purpose and Method

The aim of the study was to secure evidence from the field for the purpose of determining the effect of the Laboratory program upon the classroom teaching behavior of selected secondary school social studies student teachers. The optional nature of the Laboratory program fortunately provided two different sections of a required methods course, each comprising twenty-five social studies student teachers, one group having participated in the Laboratory training while the other had not. (A University Methods instructor could require his students, to the extent space was available, to participate in the program.) Public school pupil evaluations and videotape recordings were planned to be made of the initial teaching efforts of these fifty student teachers and also of a lesson during their final week of student teaching. Due to scheduling difficulties, distorted audio recording, and refusal of two school officials, only thirty-three usable tapes were obtained the first week; thirty-two of these were re-taped during the last week.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed and tested by the investigation: the student teachers who had participated in the Laboratory program would:

1. As seen by their pupils, receive more favorable evaluations of one of their initial teaching efforts and also of one of their final week's lessons on the ten-item Teacher Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS). (Appendix A)
2. As seen by their pupils, receive more favorable evaluations of their overall effectiveness during their total student teaching experience on the more comprehensive forty-one-item Illinois Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire (ITEQ). (Appendix B)
3. Be judged by their cooperating teachers to be ready earlier to assume full responsibility for classroom instruction.
4. Have higher Indirect/Direct ratios as revealed by an analysis of the two videotaped student teaching lessons using Flanders' interaction analysis technique.

Procedures and Results

Both groups were told that someone from the University would coordinate a visit to one of their classes during the first and the last week of their student teaching. When the visit was arranged, no standard lesson was prescribed; but the students and their cooperating teachers were asked to plan a "teaching" lesson rather than a library exercise, a test, reading of reports, etc. A thirty minute segment of the lesson was videotaped, followed by an orientation to and completion of the TPAS by the pupils.

A typical investigative team consisted of two graduate assistants associated with the student teaching program and able to visit an average of three classrooms daily. The four teams utilized were given detailed

explanations on the operation of the one-half inch Sony videorecorders and the modified audio system of three microphones and an amplifier. They were also given the rationale for the study and suggested procedures for the uniform and accurate collection of the desired information.

A standard forty-five minute module of activities was developed based on the shortest length of a class period in any of the schools visited. The time between class periods and the first five minutes of the class period were used to place the microphones, camera, and videorecorder. The next thirty minutes of the period were taped with the operator instructed to record a picture best suited to assist in the interaction analysis of the lesson. He attempted to follow the verbal action but also tried to record non-verbal cues useful to the observer during the analysis of the lesson. The first ten-minute section of each videotape normally was not used for the Flanders' analysis since this is the part of the period where much of the administrative routine, attendance taking, preparing for work, etc., could be expected to occur. This also allowed the student teacher and the pupils a period of time to adjust to the presence of the equipment in the classroom. In most cases little overt attention was directed to the equipment and operators after the first few minutes.

At the conclusion of the videotaping the pupils were told that the investigator would like them to evaluate the lesson that had just been completed. It was stressed that they were being asked to evaluate the particular lesson just experienced and nothing else. The TPAS and a Digitek Form were then distributed to each student. The investigator explained and discussed each of the ten items on the scale using a standardized orientation pamphlet and then asked the pupils to evaluate the area and mark the Digitek Form in the appropriate column. The ten minutes allotted for this procedure appeared to be adequate to secure uniform guidance for the pupils.

Before the data were subjected to statistical treatments the two groups were compared on the factors of sex distribution, GPA, and ACT composite scores; no statistical treatment was necessary to adjust for their effects. Charts 1 and 2 show the total data available for analysis for both groups. The data secured by use of the TPAS were processed by computer using BALANOVA, an analysis of variance test program developed by the University's Statistical Services Unit. At both Trial I (first week of actual classroom teaching) and Trial II (last week of classroom teaching) the evaluations of the lessons made by the pupils of the experimental student teachers were significantly higher. The results are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL PUPIL EVALUATIONS ON TPAS--TRIAL I

Source	d.f.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Level of Sig.
Between Groups	1	1519.66	1519.96	15.92	p<.001
Within Groups	986	94120.77	94.46		

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TOTAL PUPIL EVALUATIONS ON TPAS--TRIAL II

Source	d.f.	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Level of Sig.
Between Groups	1	2585.07	2585.07	21.08	p<.001
Within Groups	758	93192.81	122.62		

CHART 1.--DATA AVAILABLE FOR ANALYSIS OF CONTROL GROUP

Student	Video-tape I	Pupil Eval. I	Video-tape II	Pupil Eval. II	ITEQ	Coop. Teacher Eval.	GPA	ACT
9126	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9227	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
9128	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
9229	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
9130	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9231	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9232	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
9133	*	x			x	x	x	
9234	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
9235	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9236	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
9137	*	x			x	x	x	
9138	*	x			x		x	x
9139	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9240	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9141	Principal refused					x	x	
9142	*	x			x	x	x	x
9143	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
9144	Principal refused						x	x
9145	*	x			x	x	x	x
9146	Had not started teaching					x	x	x
9147	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
9148	Unable to be scheduled						x	
9149	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
9250	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
N =	16	21	16	16	17	22	25	13**

* Recording not usable due to audio distortion; second visit not scheduled.
** ACT scores not available for transfer students.

CHART 2.--DATA AVAILABLE FOR ANALYSIS OF EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Student	Video-tape I	Pupil Eval. I	Video-tape II	Pupil Eval. II	ITEQ	Coop. Teacher Eval.	GPA	ACT
8201	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8102	*	x			x	x	x	
8103	x	x	x	x		x	x	
8104	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8105	*	x			x	x	x	x
8106	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8107	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8108	Unable to be scheduled				x	x	x	x
8109	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
8210	x	x	x	x			x	x
8111	x	x	Dept. Head Refused		x		x	x
8212	x	x	x	x		x	x	
8113	Unable to be scheduled				x	x	x	x
8114	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8215	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8116	x	**	x	x	x	x	x	x
8217	*	x				x	x	x
8118	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8119	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
8220	x	x	x	x		x	x	
8121	Unable to be scheduled				x	x	x	
8122	Unable to be scheduled				x	x	x	x
8223	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8124	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
8125	*	x			x	x	x	
N =	17	20	16	16	18	23	25	15***

* Recording not usable due to audio distortion; second visit not scheduled.
** Lost by investigative team.
*** ACT scores not available for transfer students.

The first hypothesis was based on the assumption that the microteaching experiences had developed an increased sensitivity in the student teachers to the learner needs of their pupils. In the Laboratory the supervisors had stressed that a primary goal of each microlesson was that the student teacher become aware of the impact of the lesson, as it was being presented, upon the learners, his pupils. The supervisors had used the videotaped lessons to indicate situations in which the student teacher displayed good ability in judging pupil behavior; and, conversely, examples of pupil behavior cues missed had been focused upon and alternative teaching strategies discussed. A related assumption was that the microteaching experiences had better prepared the student teacher to assimilate the experiences of the actual classroom into improved teaching practices. The greater difference between the two groups for the final week's evaluation tends to support this belief.

The evidence to test the second hypothesis was secured from the pupils by the University's Office of Student Teaching which administered to all student teachers that semester the Illinois Teacher Evaluation Questionnaire (developed by the late Richard E. Spencer, Head of Measurement and Research Division, Office of Instructional Resources, University of Illinois). This was done during the last week of student teaching either by the University supervisor or by the cooperating teacher. The average scores received by the two groups for the forty-one individual items of the ITEQ were compared using a non-parametric sign test (Table 3).

Again, the experimental group student teachers were rated significantly higher by their pupils, this time on a global instrument covering four broad areas: Teaching Method, Teacher, Teacher Knowledge, and Student Interest. The Laboratory program is designed to develop controlled teaching experiences

relating to three of these areas; Teacher Knowledge is felt to be a function of the subject matter instructors and, while vital in teaching, is not an area of primary interest in the Teaching Techniques Laboratory. The differences seen by the pupils in this area may reflect an actual situation or be an example of the "halo effect" so common in subjective evaluation.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF SIGN TEST RESULTS OF ITEQ MEANS FOR ALL ITEMS

	+	-
Experimental	34	6
Control	6	34
	$z = 4.26$	$p<.00001$

Source: Sidney Siegel, Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), pp.68-75.

The data to test for the third hypothesis were secured from the cooperating teacher during the last week of student teaching. An examination of the data revealed that the cooperating teachers saw no statistically significant difference between the two groups along this dimension. The increased self-confidence and general poise in the classroom situation assumed for the experimental group was not supported.

One of the major problems encountered in field studies is the difficulty the investigator faces in controlling his variables. This was illustrated when, in accordance with the design, course rationales were obtained from the two methods instructors for the student teachers involved. Unknown to the investigator, the control group methods instructor had given his students intensive practice in the use of classroom observation systems with a heavy emphasis on

Flanders' system before they left for student teaching. In addition, he had given them the opportunity to plan and present several lessons to his University High School social studies classes. During these lessons teams of peer observers were appointed to use Flanders' system to categorize the lesson. Immediately following these practice teaching sessions his methods class would meet for a second hour, and the practice teacher would receive feedback in the form of completed matrices and interpretations from the observation teams. The effect of this intensive training and practice is difficult to assess. However, many investigators who have trained student teachers in Flanders' system report that as a result these student teachers tend generally to increase their use of indirect influence behaviors (thus having higher Indirect/Direct ratios), to ask more questions, to have students who talked more, and to lecture less when observed in subsequent classroom situations.[2]

It seems appropriate at this time to describe briefly the Flanders Interaction Analysis System. This is a relatively objective classroom observation system consisting of ten categories describing teacher and student verbal behavior. Seven of the categories are assigned to the teacher and are divided into two areas. Categories one through four represent indirect teacher influence, e.g., 1 - accepts students' feelings, 2 - praises students, 3 - accepts or uses

---

[2]Elizabeth Hunter and Edmund Amidon, "Direct Experience in Teacher Education: Innovation and Experimentation," Journal of Teacher Education, XVII, No. 3 (1966), pp. 282-289.

Jeffery Kirk and Edmund Amidon, "When Student Teachers Study Interaction," Elementary School Journal, LXVIII, No. 2 (1967), pp. 97-104.

Gertrude Moskowitz, "A Comparison of Foreign Language Student Teachers Trained and not Trained in Interaction Analysis," Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February, 1968.

Richard L. Ober, "The Nature of Interaction Analysis," High School Journal, LI (October, 1967), pp. 7-16.

ideas of students, 4 - asks questions. Categories five through seven represent direct teacher influence, e.g., 5 - lecture, 6 - direction, 7 - criticism. The various I/D ratios are secured by dividing the frequency of indirect categorizations by the frequency of direct categorizations in selected combinations. Consequently, the higher the ratio, the more the teacher employed indirect verbal behavior. Categories eight and nine describe student verbal behavior, e.g., 8 - student talk, response; 9 - student talk, initiation. The tenth category is used to record silence or confusion during the class.

The system is used by having an observer identify and record by number the verbal category heard every three seconds. Observations are then tabulated on a 10 x 10 matrix in pairs; the first member of the pair indicates the row index and the second, the column index. Each observation, with the exception of the first and last, is used twice in forming the matrix.

After the videotapes were categorized in accordance with Flanders' system; the results put through a computer program; and matrices, ratios, and percentages developed, the fourth hypothesis of higher Indirect/ Direct ratios for the experimental group was not supported; but the findings of the investigators mentioned above were supported, as shown in Tables 4 and 5. This development, while contrary to the investigative hypothesis, would seem to have provided an unexpected opportunity to secure additional evidence tending to support the underlying investigative assumption that on-campus training programs do have an effect on the student teacher's classroom behavior and that this effect can be measured in the field.

TABLE 4

SELECTED RATIOS FROM COMBINED MATRICES
FOR TRIALS AND GROUPS

Ratio	Experimental I	Experimental II	Control I	Control II
Indirect/Direct (I/D)	.41	.41	.68	.54
Revised Indirect-Direct (i/D)	1.89	1.94	2.59	2.60
Rows 8 and 9 (I/D)	2.32	1.75	2.82	2.66
Row 8 (I/D)	25.71	5.19	5.12	13.43
Row 9 (I/D)	5.75	2.62	5.08	3.00

The following formulas are necessary for an understanding of the various ratios shown:

1. Indirect-Direct (I/D) is computed from the frequencies in columns 1 through 4 divided by frequencies in columns 5 through 7.
2. Revised (i/D) is made up of the frequencies in columns 1 through 3 divided by frequencies in columns 6 and 7.
3. Rows 8 and 9 (I/D) is developed from the frequencies in rows 8 and 9 columns 1 through 4 divided by the frequencies in rows 8 and 9 columns 5 through 7.
4. Row 8 (I/D) comprises the frequencies in row 8 columns 1 through 3 divided by the frequencies in row 8 columns 6 and 7.
5. Row 9 (I/D) is made up of the frequencies in row 9 columns 1 through 3 divided by the frequencies in row 9 columns 6 and 7.

TABLE 5

TOTAL NUMBER OF FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF FLANDERS' CATEGORIES BY TRIAL AND GROUP

	Experimental				Control			
	Trial		Trial		Trial		Trial	
Category	I f	I %	II f	II %	I f	I %	II f	II %
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	125	2.0	79	1.3	151	2.4	65	1.0
3	223	3.5	190	3.2	230	3.6	237	3.7
4	774	12.3	753	12.5	995	15.7	834	13.0
5	2562	40.7	2336	38.9	1876	29.6	1987	30.9
6	175	2.8	118	2.0	90	1.4	85	1.3
7	9	.1	21	.3	57	.9	31	.5
8	1151	18.3	1311	21.8	1546	24.4	1685	26.2
9	801	12.7	726	12.1	922	14.5	817	12.7
10	475	7.5	472	7.9	481	7.6	690	10.7
Total	6295		6006		6348		6431	

Discussion

A major finding of the study consists of the evidence that student teachers who had participated in the Teaching Techniques Laboratory program received significantly higher pupil evaluations of their videotaped lessons and also of their total student teaching experience than did the control group. A Laboratory objective, clearly stated for the first two familiarization microteaching periods and implied as a desired learning outcome for the student teacher in all other microteaching experiences, is that each teacher trainee should "learn to monitor the behaviors of students and make compensatory modifications"[3] in his teaching behavior. During their Laboratory program teacher trainees are alerted to the host of behavioral cues that their pupils are

[3]"Instructions to Practicing Teachers," Teaching Techniques Laboratory, University of Illinois, 1967, p. 1, (mimeographed).

providing. Many of these cues are non-verbal communications; but all provide essential feedback concerning the degree of the pupils' interest in, understanding of, and achievement of the lesson objective. In this investigation an attempt was made to measure the effect of this training.

This major finding of significant difference in the pupil evaluations of the two groups is encouraging and should prove useful in curriculum planning for pre-service programs. As additional evidence of student teaching classroom behavior is developed through further field investigations, tentative relations between a specific desired behavior and on-campus training programs can be attempted. As a result, the methods instructor could have more choices and evidence available to him as he constructs a curriculum hopefully leading to the desired teaching behaviors he feels important for his teachers.

The data secured in this investigation strongly suggest that videotaped microteaching, if used in a well conceived program of controlled teaching experiences prior to student teaching, is not mere gadgetry but an effective innovation in teacher preparation and is a technique that has much to offer institutions and individuals charged with the responsibility of supplying teachers for our nation's schools. A further, more practical, result demonstrated by this investigation is that an instructor of an on-campus training program can move portable videotape equipment into widely separated student teaching classrooms and gather evidence in an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of his training program. Through the use of modern technological advances in electronic and data processing equipment today's teacher educator has found powerful allies in answering the question, Does my training program achieve its stated objectives? With the current interest in accountability in education and performance based teacher training curricula, answers to this question become even more necessary.

APPENDIX A

TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SCALE (Excerpt)

AIMS

A. Were the learning aims of this micro-lesson understood?

B. Were the learning aims of this micro-lesson developed?

CONTENT

C. Was the content of this micro-lesson meaningful?

D. Was the content of this micro-lesson well organized?

METHOD

E. Was the method employed appropriate to the aims of the micro-lesson?

F. Was the method employed stimulating to the learner?

G. Was the method employed successful in terms of the lesson's learning aims?

EVALUATION

H. Did the teacher evaluate his success by keeping in contact with the learners?

I. Did the teacher's method of lesson evaluation encourage learner participation?

ACCOMPLISHMENT

J. Does the learner have a feeling of accomplishment concerning this micro-lesson?

Pupil responses to the ten items are recorded in one of seven short descriptive categories ranging in scale from "no" or "not" to "exceptional" or "superior." For example: Item A, 1) no understanding, 2) doubtful understanding, 3) some understanding, 4) generally understood, 5) good understanding, 6) clearly understood, 7) exceptional understanding.

APPENDIX B

ILLINOIS TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (Excerpt)

1. The teacher seems confident and knowledgeable.
2. The class can easily hoodwink the teacher.
3. The teacher knows what she (he) is talking about.
4. I like this teacher.
5. This teacher has "favorites" in class.
6. This class is quite interesting.
7. Quite a boring teacher.
8. Discipline is a problem in this class.
9. Subject is easy to follow.
10. The teacher considers teaching a chore.
11. The teacher seems to talk down to student.
12. The class material is poorly organized.
13. This class is not much fun.
14. The teacher seems to feel afraid she (he) will do something wrong.
15. The teacher gives extra attention to students willingly.
16. I think this teacher teaches quite well.
17. Out of all the teachers I have had, this teacher ranks quite high.
18. The pace of teaching is too slow.
19. The teacher seems confused.
20. The tests are too difficult.
21. Generally, the teacher seems well organized.
22. The teacher changes the method of teaching to suit the occasion.
23. An exciting teacher.
24. I would like to have another teacher like this one.
25. This class is a waste of time.
26. Overall, this subject is one of my favorites.
27. The text material is very good.
28. More teachers should be like this.
29. This class is quite rewarding.
30. Not much is gained by studying this subject.
31. The teacher encourages new ideas and viewpoints.
32. Homework assignments are helpful in understanding the subject.
33. Not enough student discussion.
34. The teacher has a thorough knowledge of the subject.
35. The types of test questions used in this class are good.
36. The teacher does not explain things very well
37. An uninteresting teacher.
38. This class is one of the poorest of all my classes.
39. The teacher gets off the point too often.
40. Many other teachers I have had can teach better.
41. I like this teacher primarily because I like the subject.

An agree-disagree response code is used: SA, A, D, and SD.